

Amendments to the Drawings:

A proposed drawing change is submitted herewith. Proposed changes are shown in red. The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet, which includes Fig. 1, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1. In Fig. 1, reference characters -- 80 -- (designating the horizontal bar) and -- 80' -- (designating the slot) have been added.

Attachment:	Replacement Sheet
	Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

By the present amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 6-8, and cancelled Claim 2. Claims 1 and 3-12 remain pending in the present application. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during the personal interview held November 21, 2005. The present response summarizes the substance of the interview. At the interview proposed amendments to the specification, drawings and claims were presented for discussion. The proposed amendments to the specification and drawings sought to overcome the objections thereof. Proposed amended Claim 1 set forth a device to move heavy objects including, inter alia, a handle assembly having an H-shaped handle stand that is perpendicularly attached to the proximal end of the substantially flat rectangular body adjacent to a lower end of the stand. Also, two handles extend perpendicularly from the H-shaped handle stand at an upper end thereof. Arguments were advanced that the applied prior art references do not show the specific perpendicular arrangements of the H-shaped handle stand and handles, as recited in the claims. The Examiner indicated the proposed amendments to the specification and drawings appear to overcome the objections, and that the proposed amendment to the claims appears to overcome the outstanding rejections.

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because certain claimed features were not shown in the drawings. Specifically, the 3" high board of Claim 2, and the fitted groove of the horizontal bars of Claim 12 have not been shown. Applicant has canceled Claim 2, thus rendering this objection moot. The drawings have been corrected to show the fitted grooves 80' (see corrected Fig. 1). Applicant submits that this

objection to the drawings is now moot, and requests the withdrawal of this ground of objection.

The Examiner objected to the disclosure under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1), as failing to provide a proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Applicant has amended the specification at page 11 to reflect that the slings may be made of cloth, as set forth in original Claim 8. In addition, Applicant has amended the specification at page 12, in concert with the corrected drawing Fig. 1, to reflect the fitted groove, as recited in original Claim 12.

The Examiner objected to Claims 7 and 8 for informalities. Applicant has amended Claims 7 and 8 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Specifically, the phrase "wherein the slings are" has been rewritten as --wherein each one of the slings are--. Applicant requests the withdrawal of the objection of Claims 7 and 8.

In the recent Office Action the Examiner rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended Claim 6 by deleting the indefinite phrase. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 6, as amended, meets the specific requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thibault (FR 1.157.626) in view of Eckman (US '537) and Edhart (US '446). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant will advance arguments hereinbelow to illustrate the manner in which the presently claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited and applied prior art. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

The applied primary prior art reference to Thibault discloses a uni-wheeled framed cart having a container supported thereon. The framed cart of Thibault does not provide a flat rectangular body, a handle assembly including an H-shaped handle stand perpendicularly attached to the end of the rectangular body. The handle assembly also having a pair of handles extending perpendicularly from the handle stand. In addition, Thibault does not disclose the slings attached to the handles, and the cowl disposed about the wheel.

The applied secondary reference to Eckman discloses a collapsible cart having a sling attachable to the handles for distributing the load over the cart. The applied secondary prior art reference to Edhart discloses a folding wheelbarrow having a cowl disposed about the wheel.

The applied prior art references do not show a handle assembly, which includes an H-shaped handle stand perpendicularly attached to the proximal end of the substantially flat rectangular body, adjacent to a lower end of the stand. In addition, the applied prior art references do not show two handles extending perpendicularly from the H-shaped handle stand at an upper end thereof. There is no guidance nor motivation found in the applied prior art references to Thibault, Eckman, and Edhart, either alone or in combination, as alleged by the Examiner, that would have led one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the unique structural combination of elements as set forth in Applicant's claims.

The claims in this application have been revised to more particularly define Applicant's unique construction in view of the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the claims in light of the amendments and for the following reasons is respectfully requested.

Applicant has amended independent Claim 1 to recite inter alia, a handle assembly including an H-shaped handle stand having an upper end and a lower end. The H-shaped handle stand being perpendicularly attached to the proximal end of the substantially flat rectangular body adjacent to the lower end. Further, independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the handle assembly includes two handles extending perpendicularly from the H-shaped handle stand at the upper end. Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons, amended independent Claim 1, along with Claims 3-12 depending therefrom are allowable over the prior art applied of record.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If such is not the case, the Examiner is requested to kindly contact the undersigned in an effort to satisfactorily conclude the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Warren S. Edmonds
Registration No. 39,642
(703) 486-1000

RCL:DHT:wse



Appl. No. 10/713,040
Art Unit 3618
Customer No. 37833
Confirmation No. 1144
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes




Fig. 1